REMARKS

Claims 1, 5-8, 10 and 11 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 10 and 11 are amended. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 5, 6, 8 and 11 can be found, for example, in Fig. 8. No new matter is added. In view of at least the following, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

I. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 5, 6, 7 and 11 as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,535,620 to Nichols in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,717,869 to Moran et al. (Moran); rejects claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Nichols in view of Moran and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,625,789 to Ara et al. (Ara); and rejects claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Nichols in view of Moran and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,794,005 to Steinman. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts that Nichols discloses most of the elements of independent claims 1, 5, 6 and 11, yet concedes that Nichols fails to disclose at least

> a storage section; an event data storage section that is configured to store into the storage section as event data, a time when a setting operation is carried out; a value of the data at the time; and information about the data, only when the setting operation of the data through the output data setting section is detected by a microcomputer; and an event playback section,

as recited, in part, in claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 5, 6 and 11. The Office Action further alleges that Moran cures the deficiencies of claims 1, 5, 6 and 11 as discussed above.

Additionally, neither Nichols, Moran, either alone or in any combination, discloses

> an event data storage section that is configured to store into the storage section as event data, a time when a setting operation is carried out; a value of the data at the time; and information about the data, only when the setting operation of the data through the output data setting section is detected by a microcomputer,

as recited in claims 1, 5, 6 and 8, and similarly recited in claim 11.

Although the Office Action concedes that Nichols does not disclose an event data storage section, or the corresponding method feature, of the present invention, in fact, Nichols does disclose storing data obtained from the control target (i.e., the average injector pulse width), but does not disclose storing data which is set by the user.

Further, with respect to Moran, the Office Action asserts that Moran's session storage device 103 (Fig. 1; col. 3, lines 1-50) corresponds to the claimed event data storage system. However, Moran is directed to the field of multimedia capture, replay and editing of sessions (col. 1, lines 28-29). Moran's invention comprises a user interface for controlling playback of temporal data representing a collaborative activity, such as a meeting. The temporal data is stored by one or more capture devices, such as an audio recorder or electronic whiteboard. The temporal data is comprised of timestreams and events, wherein the timestreams are, for example, audio and video recordings, or a stored history of the actions on an electronic whiteboard. In Moran, the events are occurrences within a timestream, and the events are used to create indices which provide direct access to a point or span in time during the collaborative activity (col. 3, lines 3-5).

In the presently claimed invention, the data is defined as data which is continuously output to a control target during execution of a simulation. Therefore, the information to be stored by Moran's capture device during a meeting, such as a conversation during a meeting or writing to the electronic whiteboard, differs from the claimed data because the data stored in Moran is discrete data, and not continuous data, as in the claimed invention. Additionally, Moran is silent as to an interrelationship between the simulation apparatus and the control target. A conversation during a meeting or writing on the electronic whiteboard is not data to be output to a control target. The presently claimed invention provides the event data storage section as a means for solving the problems that occur when all continuous data are stored

during stimulation. To the contrary, Moran merely discloses storing and editing discrete, or discontinuous, data.

Further, because the technical field of Moran, which is directed to a method for storing and editing a collaborative activity such as a meeting, is not related to the technical field of Nichols, which is directed to a system for testing an engine, there is no motivation to combine the teachings.

Therefore, claims 1, 5, 6 and 11 are patentable over Nichols and Moran in any combination. Thus, claim 7 also is patentable over the applied references for at least its dependency from claim 1, as well as for the additional features it recites.

Further, Ara fails to cure the deficiencies of Nichols and Moran with respect to claim 8. Therefore, claim 8 also is patentable over Nichols, Moran and Ara in any combination. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of all pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Linda M. Saltiel
Registration No. 51,122

JAO:LMS/jls

Date: January 21, 2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461